## Case 3:18-md-02843-VC Document 1118 Filed 03/01/23 Page 1 of 3

1	GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP	GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
	Orin Snyder (pro hac vice)	Deborah Stein (SBN 224570)
2	osnyder@gibsondunn.com	dstein@gibsondunn.com
2	200 Park Avenue	Heather Richardson
3	New York, NY 10166-0193	hrichardson@gibsondunn.com 333 South Grand Avenue
4	Telephone: 212.351.4000 Facsimile: 212.351.4035	Los Angeles, CA 90071-3197
7	1 desimile. 212.331.4033	Telephone: 213.229.7000
5	Rosemarie T. Ring (SBN 220769)	Facsimile: 213.229.7520
	rring@gibsondunn.com	
6	Martie Kutscher (SBN 302650)	Joshua S. Lipshutz (SBN 242557)
	mkutscherclark@gibsondunn.com	jlipshutz@gibsondunn.com
7	555 Mission Street, Suite 3000	1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
	San Francisco, CA 94105-0921	Washington, DC 20036-5306
8	Telephone: 415.393.8200	Telephone: 202.955.8500
	Facsimile: 415.393.8306	Facsimile: 202.467.0539
9	Attorneys for Defendant Facebook, Inc.	
10	Altorneys for Defendant Pacebook, Inc.	
11	UNITED STAT	TES DISTRICT COURT
12	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
12		
13		
14		
	IN RE: FACEBOOK, INC. CONSUMER	CASE NO. 3:18-MD-02843-VC
15	PRIVACY USER PROFILE LITIGATION,	EACEDOOK INC 2C DDELIMINADY
16		FACEBOOK, INC.'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO THE STATE OF NEW
10	This document relates to:	MEXICO'S MOTION TO INTERVENI
17	11110 000 011110110 10110100	FILED PURSUANT TO THE COURT'
	ALL ACTIONS	MARCH 1 ORDER
18		
19		
20		
ا ۷		
21		
_		
22		
23		
24		
25		
۷		
26		
-~		
27		
28		

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP Facebook does not contend that the proposed settlement in this case (the "MDL"), if approved, would release any portion of the claim brought by New Mexico in a separate action being litigated in New Mexico state court. What preclusive effect, if any, a final judgment approving the proposed settlement in this case could have on claims asserted by New Mexico in a separate action being litigated in New Mexico state court is a question that should be addressed, if at all, by that court.

A final judgment approving the proposed settlement in the MDL could, through the operation of the doctrines of issue preclusion or claim preclusion, have some preclusive effect on the State's claims. *Rex, Inc. v. Manu. Hous. Comm. of State of N.M.*, 892 P.2d 947, 956 (N.M. 1995); *v. IntelliGender, LLC*, 771 F.3d 1169, 1179 (9th Cir. 2014); *New Mexico v. Capital One Bank*, 980 F. Supp. 2d 1346, 1349, 1353 (D.N.M. 2013); *King v. HSBC Bank Nevada*, 2013 WL 12138908, at \*1, \*3 (D.N.M. 2013).

In response to the State's demand for confirmation that a judgment in the MDL will have no effect on the State's claim, Facebook simply reserved it rights. To be clear: Facebook is *not* asking this Court to enjoin the State's claim or make any determination about the preclusive effect of a judgment in the MDL. Indeed, binding precedent makes clear that preclusion determinations should be made by the court where preclusion is asserted (here, New Mexico state court), not by the court that entered the potentially preclusive judgment (here, this Court). *Smith v. Bayer Corp.*, 564 U.S. 299, 307 (2011) ("Deciding whether and how prior litigation has preclusive effect is usually the bailiwick of the second court."); *MK Hillside Partners v. CIR*, 826 F.3d 1200, 1207 n.7 (9th Cir. 2016) ("[T]he first court does not get to dictate to other courts the preclusion consequences of its own judgment."); *Sonner v. Premier Nutrition Corp.*, 49 F.4th 1300, 1307 (9th Cir. 2022) (similar).

In light of the above, the State's request to intervene should be denied. Whatever interest the State has in determining the future preclusive effect of this Court's judgment is not a "significantly protectable interest *related to this case*." (*Contra* Mot. at 6, emphasis added). That interest relates to—and should be adjudicated in—the pending litigation in New Mexico. *Smith*, 564 U.S. at 307; *MK Hillside*, 826 F.3d at 1207 n.7; *Sonner*, 49 F.4th at 1307.

Any restitution interest here belongs to the New Mexico Facebook users; the State's interest is purely "representative." *Rex*, 892 P.2d at 955. An intervenor whose rights are "derivative" of current

1 parties "has no significant protectable interest" that warrants mandatory intervention. *In re* 2 Facebook, Inc. Shareholder Derivative Privacy Litig., 367 F. Supp. 3d 1108, 1130 (N.D. Cal. 2019). 3 Facebook reserves the right to further develop these and other arguments in its response. 4 Dated: March 1, 2023 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP 5 By: /s/ Rosemarie Ring Orin Snyder (pro hac vice) 6 osnyder@gibsondunn.com 200 Park Avenue 7 New York, NY 10166-0193 Telephone: 212.351.4000 8 Facsimile: 212.351.4035 9 Deborah Stein (SBN 224570) dstein@gibsondunn.com 10 Heather Richardson Hrichardson@gibsondunn.com 11 333 South Grand Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90071-3197 12 Telephone: 213.229.7000 Facsimile: 213.229.7520 13 Joshua S. Lipshutz (SBN 242557) 14 ilipshutz@gibsondunn.com 1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. 15 Washington, DC 20036-5306 Telephone: 202.955.8500 16 Facsimile: 202.467.0539 17 Rosemarie T. Ring (SBN 220769) rring@gibsondunn.com 18 Kristin A. Linsley (SBN 154148) klinsley@gibsondunn.com 19 Martie Kutscher (SBN 302650) mkutscherclark@gibsondunn.com 20 555 Mission Street, Suite 3000 San Francisco, CA 94105-0921 21 Telephone: 415.393.8200 Facsimile: 415.393.8306 22 Russell H. Falconer (pro hac vice) 23 rfalconer@gibsondunn.com 2100 McKinney Avenue, Suite 1100 24 Dallas, TX 75201 Telephone: 214.698.3170 25 Facsimile: 214.571.2958 26 Attorneys for Defendant Facebook, Inc. 27 28

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP